DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 459 TM 005 652

AUTHOR Barber, Lucie W.; And Others
TITLE Construct Validity of the Barber Scales of Self-Regard for Preschool Children.
NOTE 18p.; For related documents, see TM 005 639-653
AVAILABLE FROM Union College Character Research Project, 207 State St., Schenectady, New York 12305 ($1.70), Seven Scales of Self Regard for 10 persons $25.00, Manual $6.50

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Development; Correlation; Mothers; Parents; Personality Tests; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Rating Scales; *Self Concept Tests; Statistical Analysis; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Barber Scales of Self Regard Preschool Form; Minnesota Personality Profile II

ABSTRACT

The Minnesota Personality Profile II used as a test of construct validity for the Barber Self-Regard Scales--Preschool. Before analysis of data, hypotheses were arrived at concerning predicted relationships between the two instruments. Fifty-two correlation coefficients were predicted as significant or nonsignificant statistically. Hypotheses were accepted in 29 instances and rejected in 23 instances. Nine clusters of frequencies at intersections of scale points on contingency tables were predicted. Two of these clusters were found; five were near misses, while the remaining two predictions were rejected. The data were inspected for all significant correlation coefficients and all clusters. A pattern emerged which suggests that the commonality between the MPPII and the global construct which the seven Self-Regard Scales measure revolves around (1) control of emotions, (2) realism, and (3) persistence. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128459

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE BARBER SCALES OF SELF-REGARD FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Lucia W. Barber, Helen C. Cernik and Kimberly Barton

Introduction

In the construction of any assessment device, it is desirable to explore the meaning of what it is that is being measured. The description of content validity, particularly the explanation of how the Self-Regard Scales were constructed (Barber & Peatling '75), is one approach. Another approach is through testing for Construct Validity. This initial attempt at studying Construct Validity of the Self-Regard Scales is reported here.

Instrumentation

The Minnesota Personality Profile II (MPPII) was chosen because of ease, in a volunteer sample, for both parents and teachers to complete the instrument for a child. The MPPII has a long history beginning c. 1950 when its forerunner, the MPPI, was used as part of a battery of tests in the Nobles County Project by the Institute for Child Development at the University of Minnesota. The first Personality Profile was reduced to ten scales by item analysis for items best predicting personality adjustment. The resulting MPPII was used with permission of Dr. Dale B. Harris (personal letter) who was director of the Institute in the 1950's. He points out that "'the scoring weights' at the five positions in each scale were arrived at by corsensus of six Ph. D. 'experts' as representing 'desirability' from a general functional mental health viewpoint. 5 is high; 1 is low." Thus, the instrument assesses general emotional and personal "adjustment".

Much of the information on the MPPII is found only in fugitive documents. The MPPII was used as part of a battery of tests in 1954 for all school children (n = 3500) in grades 4-12 in Nobles County. Some results

TM005 652

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

of a 1958 follow-up are reported in published form. (Werner and Gallietel, '61). Youngsters from the 1954 population were identified for delinquency (n = 146) or public recognition (n = 136); also for emotional disturbance (n = 18) in 1958. These groups were compared with the population mean, instrument by instrument, in the battery on 1954 scores. After control for IQ and SES, which accounted for sizable proportions in prediction, the MPPII was the best predictor in the battery of tests.

The Nobles County Project was abandoned in the late '50's when John Anderson, then its director, retired. No norms, reliability or other technicalities are readily available, if available at all. The content validity of the MPPII is its most attractive feature for comparison with the Self-Regard Scales. For example, one would expect a relationship to exist between the Self-Regard Scale "Completing Tasks" and the MPPII Scale "How well does he persist at a task". One would also expect a relationship between certain scale points of the MPPII Scales and scale points on the Self-Regard Scales. For example, one would expect scale point 4 on the "Purposeful Learning of Skills" Scale which is "they accept coaching and help" to be related to the MPPII Scale #6 scale point "uses own skill first, then seeks help". Raters on the MPPII had no knowledge of scores for any scale point. They completed MPPII's which had no numbers (scores) by merely circling words or phrases best describing a child. The MPPII is reproduced here with scores for the reader's information.

3.
PARENT

Institute of Child Welfare — University of Minnesota

PERSONALITY PROFILE II

Name of Child _____ *School* _____ *Child's Grade* _____ *Child's Age* _____

Indicate whether you are a: *teacher* ☐ *mother* ☐ *father* ☐

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the word or phrase that corresponds to your rating of the child.

1. In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is

Poor 1	Fair 2	Average 3	Good 4	Excellent 5

2. How realistic is he?

Knows his own faults and good points 5	Fairly realistic about himself 4	Somewhat realistic 3	Doesn't seem to know the score about himself 2	Completely unaware of what he is like 1

3. How well does he persist at a task?

Gives up very easily 1	Gives up when he has a little trouble 2	Takes quite a bit to make him give up 4	Sticks to a job when it is very troublesome 5	Won't give up in spite of anything 3

4. How well does he take responsibility for what he does?

Takes responsibility for what he does 5	Seldom makes excuses 4	Sometimes alibis 3	Tries to pass the buck 2	Definitely blames others when he is in the wrong 1

5. How attentive is he in school?

Inattentive most of the time 1	Tends to be inattentive 2	Moderately attentive 3	Usually attentive 4	Very attentive 5

6. How dependent is he?

Tackles problems very much on his own 5	Independent 3	Uses own skill first, then seeks help 4	Dependent 2	Seeks help at slightest difficulty 1

7. How flexible is this child?

Very easily led or influenced 1	Tends to "drift with the tide" 4	Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others 5	Slow to adapt to new ideas 2	Rigid, inflexible 3

8. How much at ease is he?

Passive 2	Relaxed 5	Settles down after excitement 4	Nervous 1	Tense 3

9. How well can he "take it"?

Tough, nothing offends him 4	Insensitive, hard to hurt 2	Has feelings, but controls them 5	Soft, sometimes can't take it 3	Touchy, very easily hurt 1

10. How compliant is he?

Does opposite of what he is told 2	Often contrary, resistive 1	Agrees to sensible requests 5	Goes out of his way to please 4	Too anxious to please; apple-polishes 3

This Personality Profile II form used with the permission of the Institute of Child Welfare of the University of Minnesota.

X-74-114

Methodology

The three researchers, Lucie W. Barber, Kimberly Barton and Helen Cernik, who had been most intimately involved in the construction of the Self-Regard Scales, studied the Scales in relation to the ten MPPII's Scales. Each of these judges made predictions (hypotheses) as to relationships between the two assessment devices. Hypotheses where all three judges agreed were recorded at least two months prior to the arrival of the computer print outs of results.

Since the analysis of data involved correlation coefficients and contingency tables, two types of hypotheses were recorded: (1) coefficients for Self-Regard Scales with each of the MPPII Scales as either positively or negatively significant $\leq .05$ level of probability or zero order (non-significant, $> .05$ level of probability); and (2) clusters from Contingency Tables of frequencies representing 15% or more of the sample where scale points on Self-Regard Scales and scale points on MPPII Scales converge. The outcome of these hypotheses will be reported, as will results from the following procedure in analysis.

In order for maximum understanding of Self-Regard Scales from relationships to MPPII Scales, all statistically significant coefficients were recorded, as well as all clusters of frequencies representing 15% or more of the sample.

Only mother ratings on the Self-Regard Scales and mother ratings on MPPII's are reported here. In a reliability study of the Self-Regard Scales (Barber '75) the greatest reliability (coefficients in the high .90's) was found between mothers and day care teachers who were with the children 8-1/2 to 9-1/2 hrs. a day, five days a week. Thus it was assumed that mothers, in this sample, knew their child best and would rate the MPPII's accordingly. Also, the correlation coefficients for mother and all teachers on the MPPII Scales were all statistically non-significant except for the Scale "How attentive is he in school" ($n = 87, .3792, p \leq .01$).

Results

The results will be found in the following seven tables, one for each of the seven Scales of Self-Regard. The first two columns on the left give the results of the product moment correlations for each of the ten MPPII Scales with the Self-Regard Scale. Column 1 lists the MPPII Scales by titles from the instrument itself. Column 2 lists the coefficients and their level of probability. The n is 90 for all coefficients. There were 52 hypotheses concerning the coefficients. These are indicated in column 2 by underlines: xxxx where a positive coefficient was predicted, and ---- where a zero order coefficient was predicted. There were no negatively significant coefficients predicted.

The remaining columns on each of the tables display results from the contingency tables. Column 3 describes the MPPII scale points for the Scales listed in Column 1. The remaining columns are titled by scale points for the Self-Regard Scale and the description of these points. Only those clusters where frequencies represent 15% or more of a n (90) are listed. For example, on Table I, when the contingency table for "Purposeful Learning of Skills" with MPPII Scale 1 (general adjustment) was inspected only one cluster that met the criterion was found -- at the intersection of MPPII Scale 1, scale point #4 (good) and "Purposeful Learning of Skills", scale point #3 (accepts coaching and help) there was a frequency of 31 representing 34.4% of the sample.

There were 15 hypotheses as to where clusters would occur on the contingency tables. These were reduced to 9 because 6 of the original 15 hypotheses involved scale points 1. Probably due to the age of the children in the sample (a preponderance of 4 and 5-year-olds with only one 2-year-old) there were either zero frequencies for the MPPII or the Self-Regard Scale or both (Barber, Cernik & Barton '75). The 9 remaining hypotheses are shown on the tables only where they were accepted. A check mark will be found to the right of the percentage figure. The hypotheses that were not accepted will be reported separately.

TABLE I

SELF-REGARD SCALE: PURPOSEFUL LEARNING OF SKILLS (MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

MPPII Scale n = 90	Self-Reg. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 The "Me Do It" Stage	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 They Accept Coaching and Help	Self-Regard Scale Point 5 They Practice in Order to be Prepared
1. In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	15075 ns xxxxx	4. Good		34.4% n = 31	
2. How realistic is he?	.28304 .01	4. Fairly realistic about himself		26.7% n = 24	
3. How well does he persist at a task?	.17762 .10 xxxxx	2. Gives up when he has a little trouble		17.8% n = 16	
		4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up		27.8% n = 25	
4. How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.15326 ns	3. Sometimes alibis		26.7% n = 24	
5. How attentive is he in school?	.13266 ns	3. Moderately attentive		18.9% n = 17	
		4. Usually attentive		23.3% n = 21	
6. How dependent is he?	.06178 ns	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help		35.6% ✓ n = 32	
7. How flexible is this child?	.14881 ns -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others		42.2% n = 38	16.7% n = 15
8. How much at ease is he?	.11694 ns ———	4. Settles down after excitement		26.7% n = 24	
		5. Relaxed		22.2% n = 20	
9. How well can he "take it"?	.20502 .05 -----	3. Soft, sometimes can't take it		21.1% n = 19	
		5. Has feelings, but controls them		20.0% n = 18	
10. How compliant is he?	.13407 ns -----	5. Agrees to sensible requests	16.7% n = 15	38.9% n = 35	15.6% n = 14

TABLE II

SELF-REGARD SCALE: COMPLETING TASKS (MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

MPPII Scale n = 90	SELF-REG. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 Children will complete a simple task, even by themselves	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Children are attempting more complex tasks
1. In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.19408 .10 -- --	4. Good		32.2% n = 29
2. How realistic is he?	.31734 .01 -----	4. Fairly realistic about himself		30.0% n = 27
		5. Knows his own faults and good points		15.6% n = 14
3. How well does he persist at a task?	.38912 .01 xxxxx	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up		33.3% n = 30
4. How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.22457 .05 -----	3. Sometimes alibis		24.4% n = 22
		4. Seldom makes excuses		15.6% n = 14
5. How attentive is he in school?	.27612 .01 -----	3. Moderately attentive	16.7% n = 15	
		4. Usually attentive		26.7% n = 24
		5. Very attentive		15.6% n = 14
6. How dependent is he?	-.00078 ns	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help	20.0% n = 18	32.2% n = 29
7. How flexible is he?	.12019 ns -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others	17.8% n = 16	46.7% n = 42
8. How much at ease is he?	.19120 .10 -----	4. Settles down after excitement		31.1% n = 28
		5. Relaxed		25.6% n = 23
9. H[illegible] well can he [illegible]e it"?	.11066 ns -----	3. Soft, sometimes can't take it		23.3% n = 21
		5. Has feelings, but controls them		22.2% n = 20
10. How compliant is he?	.05859 ns -----	5. Agrees to sensible requests	21.1% n = 19	42.2% n = 38

TABLE III

SELF-REGARD SCALE: COPING WITH FEARS (MOTHER RATINGS)
and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

	MPPII Scale n = 90	Self-Reg. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 Children are coping when given reassurance	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Children are coping when given explanations	Self-Regard Scale Point 5 Children are coping with self-reliance
1.	In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.24643 .10 xxxxx	4. Good		22.2% n = 20	17.8% n = 16
2.	How realistic is he?	.35438 .01 -----	4. Fairly realistic about himself		21.1% n = 19	18.9% n = 17
3.	How well does he persist at a task?	.08279	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up		18.9% n = 17	20.0% n = 18
4.	How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.28810 .05	3. Sometimes alibis		21.1% n = 19	
5.	How attentive is he in school?	.17238 .10	4. Usually attentive			16.7% n = 15
6.	How dependent is he?	.10888 ns -----	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help	16.7% n = 16	25.6% n = 23	
7.	How flexible is this child?	.17836 .10 -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others		32.2% n = 29	25.6% n = 23
8.	How much at ease is he?	.09843 ns xxxxx	4. Settles down after excitement		20.0% n = 18	16.7% n = 15
9.	How well can he "take it"?	.31092 .01 -----	3. Soft sometimes can't take it	17.8% n = 16	17.8% n = 16	
			5. Has feelings, but controls them		16.7% n = 15	17.8% n = 16
10.	How compliant is he?	.41844 .01	5. Agrees to sensible requests	16.7% n = 15	28.9% n = 26	27.8% n = 25

TABLE IV

SELF-REGARD SCALE: CHILD'S RESPONSES TO REQUESTS (MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

MPPII Scale	Self-Reg. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 Acceptance	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Willing Acceptance
1. In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.16797 ns xxxxx	4. Good		28.9% n = 26
2. How realistic is he?	.29028 .01 -----	4. Fairly realistic about himself		25.6% n = 23
3. How well does he persist at a task?	.31614 .01 -----	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up	15.6% n = 14	25.6% n = 23
4. How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.25175 .02 xxxxx	3. Sometimes alibis		20.0% n = 18
5. How attentive is he in school?	.20350 .05 -----	3. Moderately attentive		18.9% n = 17
		4. Usually attentive		15.6% n = 14
6. How dependent is he?	.04662 ns -----	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help		24.4% n = 22
7. How flexible is this child?	.01394 ns -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others	15.6% n = 14	37.8% n = 34
8. How much at ease is he?	.11268 ns -----	4. Settles down after excitement		24.4% n = 22
		5. Relaxed		20.0% n = 18
9. How well can he "take it"?	.21812 .05 -----	3. Soft, sometimes can't take it		18.9% n = 17
		5. Has feelings, but controls them		20.0% n = 18
10. How compliant is he?	.19643 .10 xxxxx	5. Agrees to sensible requests	20.0% n = 18	35.6% n = 32

TABLE V

SELF-REGARD SCALE: DEALING WITH FRUSTRATIONS
(MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

	MPPII Scale n = 90	Self-Reg. and MPPII	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 Children recognize their own negative emotions and are attempting to deal with them independently	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Children have learned more and more roles for channeling their emotions positively
1.	In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.32699 .01 xxxxx	4. Good	15.6% n = 14	24.4% n = 22
2.	How realistic is he?	.33524 .01	4. Fairly realistic about himself	18.9% n = 17	22.2% n = 20
3.	How well does he persist at a task?	.25242 .02	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up	18.9% n = 17	26.7% n = 24
4.	How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.16267 ns	3. Sometimes alibis		22.2% n = 20
5.	How attentive is he in school?	.31341 .01 -----	3. Moderately attentive		18.9% n = 17
			4. Usually attentive		17.8% n = 16
6.	How dependent is he?	.07992 ns -----	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help	16.7% n = 15	26.7% n = 24
7.	How flexible is this child?	.06266 ns -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others	21.1% n = 19	35.6% n = 32
8.	How much at ease is he?	.23343 .05 -----	4. Settles down after excitement	16.7% n = 15	24.4% n = 22
			5. Relaxed		23.3% n = 21
9.	How well can he "take it"?	.32258 .01	3. Soft, sometimes can't take it	15.6% n = 14	18.9% n = 17
			5. Has feelings, but controls them		20.0% n = 18
10.	How compliant is he?	.[illegible]346 ns xxxxx	5. Agrees to sensible requests	23.3% n = 21	35.6% n = 32

TABLE VI

SELF-REGARD SCALE: SOCIALLY ACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOR

(MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

	MPPII Scale	Self-Reg. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Socially Acceptable Behavior Broadens	Self-Regard Scale Point 5 Socially Acceptable Behavior Generalizes
1.	In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.28724 .01 xxxxx	4. Good	15.6% n = 14	20.0% n = 18
2.	How realistic is he?	.33524 .01	4. Fairly realistic about himself	17.8% n = 16	23.3% n = 21
3.	How well does he persist at a task?	.15672 ns	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up	17.8% n = 16	21.1% n = 19
4.	How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.14290 ns -----	3. Sometimes alibis	15.6% n = 14	18.9% n = 17
5.	How attentive is he in school?	.14564 ns	3. Moderately attentive	17.8% n = 16	
6.	How dependent is he?	.06121 ns -----	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help	23.3% n = 21	18.9% n = 17
7.	How flexible is this child?	.26720 .01 -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others	27.8% n = 25	28.9% n = 26
8.	How much at ease is he?	.09114 ns -----	4. Settles down after excitement	23.3% n = 21	
			5. Relaxed		18.9% n = 17
9.	How well can he "take it"?	.24402 .02 xxxxx	5. Has feelings, but controls them	17.8% n = 16	
10.	How compliant is he?	.27029 .01 xxxxx	5. Agrees to sensible requests	30.0% n = 27	23.3% n = 21

TABLE VII

SELF-REGARD SCALE: DEVELOPING IMAGINATION IN PLAY (MOTHER RATINGS) and MPPII (MOTHER RATINGS)

MPPII Scale n = 90	Self-Reg. and MPPII coef.	MPPII Scale Point	Self-Regard Scale Point 3 Make-Believe Play	Self-Regard Scale Point 4 Fantasy Play	Self-Regard Scale Point 5 Reality Play
1. In my opinion, this child's general adjustment is:	.19443 .10 xxxxx	4. Good			27.8% n = 25
		5. Excellent			15.6% n = 14
2. How realistic is he?	.26904 .01 -----	4. Fairly realistic about himself			26.7% n = 24
		5. Knows his own faults and good points			15.6% n = 14
3. How well does he persist at at a task?	.30017 .01 -----	4. Takes quite a bit to make him give up			27.8% n = 25
4. How well does he take responsibility for what he does?	.18459 .10	3. Sometimes alibis			22.2% n = 20
		4. Seldom makes excuses			15.6% n = 14
5. How attentive is he in school?	.18982 .10 -----	3. Moderately attentive			17.8% n = 16
		4. Usually attentive			21.1% n = 19
6. How dependent is he?	-.02764 ns -----	4. Uses own skill first, then seeks help			32.2% n = 29
7. How flexible is this child?	.16921 ns -----	5. Takes sensible suggestions, rejects others		17.8% n = 16	41.1% n = 37
8. How much at ease is he?	.12229 ns -----	4. Settles down after excitement			30.0% n = 27
		5. Relaxed			22.2% n = 20
9. How well can he "take it"?	.10923 ns	3. Soft, sometimes can't take it			21.1% n = 19
		5. Has feelings but controls them			22.2% n = 20
10. How compliant is he?	.06235 ns -----	5. Agrees to sensible requests	15.6% n = 14		37.8% n = 34

Discussion

The hypotheses will be discussed first, followed by a discussion of all associations that were found.

The hypotheses concerning the correlation coefficients were accepted in 29 instances and rejected in 23, with the probability level of .05 as the cut-off between positive and zero order coefficients. Correlations were more successfully predicted for some of the Self-Regard Scales than for others. It is interesting to note that there were 37 zero order predictions, 23 of which confirmed hypotheses, and only 15 positive predictions, 7 of which confirmed hypotheses. It would appear that judges leaned towards non-association between the two assessment devices, and with greater success, than towards association.

The nine hypotheses concerning clusters on contingency tables were for specific associations of scale points. Two of these hypotheses were confirmed (see Table I and Table VI).

Five hypotheses came close to identifying a cluster. In Table II for the Self-Regard Scale "Completing Tasks", for MPPII Scale 4 a cluster was found at the intersection of points 4 and 4, whereas the prediction has been for points 5 and 5. Definitions for 4's and 5's are not greatly different. The same holds true for a cluster on Table IV, "Children's Response to Requests", for MPPII Scale 7, where the found cluster 4 and 5 was predicted as 5 and 5. Table V, "Dealing with Frustrations", shows 3 of these near misses. For MPPII Scale 6 a predicted cluster at scale points 3 and 3 was found at 3 and 4. MPPII Scale 9 has a cluster 3 and 3 which had been predicted as 2 and 3. This same MPPII Scale also has a cluster at points 4 and 5 which had been predicted as 5 and 5.

The remaining two hypotheses identifying clusters were rejected outright. Definitions of scale points of the clusters actually identified did not resemble the definitions of scale points in the predicted clusters.

While there is some evidence that hypotheses can be successfully confirmed concerning the relationship of Self-Regard Scales and MPPII Scales, there is also evidence that difficulties are encountered. It should be pointed out that all the original hypotheses were made upon the assumption that the sample would contain 2, 3, 4 and 5-year-olds equally distributed. This request to the schools involved in this field test apparently presented insurmountable difficulties for the schools. The distribution of the sample is skewed towards the older children thus contributing to possibly limiting the range of scores on both the Self-Regard Scales and the MPPII Scales. Both correlation coefficients and frequencies in contingency tables would be affected. It would be desirable to repeat tests of hypotheses for construct validity with another sample.

However, even with the data acquired from the present sample, some interesting results occurred when coefficients and clusters were inspected whether or not they had been originally predicted.

First, attention is focused on the correlation coefficients for Self-Regard Scale ratings and MPPII Scale ratings. These coefficients are found in the second column of each of the seven tables. Looking down the columns it will be seen that four of the seven Self-Regard Scales correlate significantly with 5 or 6 of the MPPII Scales while the remaining three correlate significantly with only two or three of the MPPII Scales. The four Self-Regard Scales most associated with the MPPII are: "Coping with Fears","Children's Responses to Requests", "Dealing with Frustrations", and "Socially Acceptable Behavior". These Scales have to do with emotional control or channeling of emotions, more so than the remaining three Scales: "Purposeful Learning of Skills", "Completing Tasks" and "Developing Imagination in Play". This suggests that at least some of the global construct Self-Regard, assessed by the Self-Regard Scales is related to the MPPII's assessment of personal adjustment by way of emotional control.

Now, focusing on the correlation coefficients in the second column but this time across tables, that is, by MPPII Scales. The outstanding observation is that MPPII Scale #2 "How realistic is he?" is significantly correlated with every one of the seven Self-Regard Scales. Predictably, self-regard should be related to realism about one's self and here is evidence to support that contention for the Self-Regard Scales.

Across tables, another MPPII Scale correlates significantly with five of the Self-Regard Scales. This is Scale #9 "How well can he take it?" Again, the element of emotional control in the global construct, Self-Regard, is supported. Another MPPII Scale, "How well does he persist at a task?" relates to four Self-Regard Scales and adds evidence for persistence in the global construct, Self-Regard. The reader can extend inspection of relationships within tables and across tables but generally speaking, there is evidence that a relationship exists between self-regard as assessed by the Self-Regard Scales and personal adjustment as assessed by the MPPII Scales, in expected directions.

When attention was focused on the results of clusters of frequencies representing 15% or more of the sample from the contingency tables, 130 such clusters were found, an average of 18.57 per table. With so many clusters, patterns were sought. Table by table, or Self-Regard Scale by Scale, the Self-Regard Scale points seemed to reflect the distribution of the sample itself which contained many more older children than younger children. However, when inspecting clusters across tables, that is by MPPII Scales, a pattern of scale points was found. For each of the seven MPPII Scales, a single MPPII scale point was involved in clusters, regardless of which Self-Regard Scale was represented. For example, for MPPII Scale 4 on "Responsibility", for every Self-Regard Scale the MPPII scale point was 3. For MPPII Scale 6 on "Dependency", for every Self-Regard Scale the MPPII scale point was 4.

The following MPPII scale points followed this pattern across all seven Self-Regard Scales:

MPPII scale 1	good general adjustment	scale pt. 4
2	fairly realistic	" " 4
3	takes quite a bit to make him give up	" " 4
4	sometimes alibis	" " 3
6	uses own skill first, then seeks help	" " 4
7	takes sensible suggestions, rejects others	" " 5
8	settles down after excitement	" " 4
10	agrees to sensible suggestions	" " 5

These characteristics, of course, must be interpreted in a preschool child's perspective and they must also be interpreted in light of the distribution of ages of the children within the sample. However, the fact of their consistency across all of the Self-Regard Scales would indicate, again, not only a relationship between Self-Regard and the MPPII's personal adjustment, but that commonalities revolve around realism, persistence and emotional control.

Summary

The MPPII was used as a test of construct validity for the Barber Self-Regard Scales - Preschool. Before analysis of data, hypotheses were arrived at concerning predicted relationships between the two instruments. Fifty-two correlation coefficients were predicted as significant or non-significant statistically. Hypotheses were accepted in 29 instances and rejected in 23 instances. Nine clusters of frequencies at intersections of scale points on contingency tables were predicted. Two of these clusters were found; five were near misses, while the remaining two predictions were rejected.

The data were inspected for all significant correlation coefficients and all clusters. A pattern emerged which suggests that the commonality between the MPPII and the global construct which the seven Self-Regard Scales measure revolves around (1) control of emotions, (2) realism and (3) persistence.

References

Barber, Lucie W. "Reliability of Seven Scales of Self-Regard for Preschool Children," Study Number 75-01-01h, Union College Character Research Project, Schenectady, N.Y. 1975.

Barber, L.W., Cernik, H.C. and Barton, K. "Description of the Design and Sample for the 1975 Field Test of the Barber Scales of Self-Regard for Preschool Children," Study Number 75-01-01g, Union College Character Research Project, Schenectady, N.Y. 1975.

Barber, Lucie W. and Peatling, John H. A Manual for the Barber Scales of Self-Regard, Preschool Form, 1975, Character Research Press, Schenectady, N. Y.

Werner, Emmy and Gallistel, Elizabeth, "Prediction of Outstanding Performance, Delinquency and Emotional Disturbance from Childhood Evaluations," Child Development, 1961, 32, 255-260.